

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-13, 17, and 19 are pending. In an office action mailed October 5, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-14, 17, and 19-20. The Examiner noted the allowability of Claims 15, 16, 18, and 21 but objected to those claims as being dependent from a rejected base claims. To place the application in condition for allowance, Claims 14-16, 18, and 20-21 have been cancelled, and each of the independent claims has been amended to incorporate the limitations of one or more of the allowable claims 15, 16, 18, and 21.

In view of the amendments and the remarks below, the applicant requests that the Examiner pass the application on to issuance.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103:** The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 and 12-14 as being unpatentable over USPN 4,003,660 issued to Christie in view of USPN 6,069,973 issued to Lin. In the office action mailed October 5, 2006, the Examiner stated that the prior art failed to teach or suggest comparing a measured spectral characteristics of the test color strip with intended spectral characteristics of the test strips and generating correction factors based on the comparisons.

**Claim 1** has been amended to recite a printing engine that is operable to generate at least one correction factor based on comparisons of measured spectral characteristics of the color strips with intended spectral characteristics of the color strips. As admitted by the Examiner, this is neither taught nor suggested by Christie and Lin. For at least this reason, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references as are Claims 2-4 based at least on their dependence from Claim 1.

**Claim 5** has been amended to recite a printing engine operable to generate at least one correction factor based on comparisons of detected color properties of the color strips with intended color properties of the color strips. As admitted by the Examiner, this is neither taught nor suggested by Christie and Lin. For at least this

reason, Claim 5 is patentable over the cited references as are Claims 6-8 based at least on their dependence from Claim 5.

**Claim 12** has been amended to recite means for obtaining correction factors based on differences between measured spectral characteristics of the color strips and intended spectral characteristics of the color strips. As admitted by the Examiner, this is neither taught nor suggested by Christie and Lin. For at least this reason, Claim 12 is patentable over the cited references as is Claim 13 based at least on its dependence from Claim 12.

**Claim 19** has been amended to recite (a) comparing a measured spectral characteristic of the color strip with an intended spectral characteristic of the color strip; and (b) generating a correction factor based on the comparing for use by a printing engine that formed the color strip. As admitted by the Examiner, this is neither taught nor suggested by Christie and Lin. For at least this reason, Claim 19 is patentable over the cited references.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103:** The Examiner rejected Claims 9-11 as being unpatentable over USPN 4,003,660 issued to Christie in view of USPN 6,069,973 issued to Lin and in further view of USPN 6,384,918 issued to Hubble. In the office action mailed October 5, 2006, the Examiner stated that the prior art failed to teach or suggest comparing a measured spectral characteristics of the test color strip with intended spectral characteristics of the test strips and generating correction factors based on the comparisons.

**Claim 9** has been amended to recite generating at least one correction factor for a printing engine based on comparisons of sensed color characteristics of the discrete areas of the color pattern region with intended spectral characteristics of the color pattern region. As admitted by the Examiner, this is neither taught nor suggested by

Christie, Lin, and Hubble. For at least this reason, Claim 9 is patentable over the cited references as are Claims 10 and 11 based at least on their dependence from Claim 9.

**CONCLUSION:** The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-13, 17, and 19 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,  
Algrid M. Gudaitis

By /Jack H. McKinney/  
Jack H. McKinney  
Reg. No. 45,685

January 5, 2007